

Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge

Comprehensive Conservation Plan “Manager for a Day” Workshops Jan. – April 2003

LISTS OF ISSUES, CONCERNS, ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION NOTES, AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS DISCUSSED

Seven “Manager for a Day” workshops were conducted to obtain “potential solutions” for issues facing the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife Refuge Complex. These all day workshops, attended by citizens and agency personnel, occurred as follows:

Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge:

January 4, 2003, Prairie du Chien High School, Prairie du Chien WI

January 11, 2003, House of Events, Savanna IL

March 8, 2003, Winona Middle School, Winona MN

March 12, 2003, Cartwright Center, UW – La Crosse, La Crosse WI, Interagency Team

March 22, 2003 Onalaska Middle School, Onalaska WI

Driftless Area National Wildlife Refuge

? February 20, 2003, Central State Bank, Elkader IA (evening only)

Trempealeau National Wildlife Refuge

? March 15, 2003 Trempealeau Middle School, Trempealeau WI

WORKSHOPS: HOW THEY WORKED

The workshops were facilitated by Dr. Onnie Byers or Kathy Holzer, Conservation Breeding Specialists Group, Apple Valley MN, except the Elkader IA workshop was facilitated by refuge staff. Each workshop began with a presentation by Refuge Manager Don Hultman on the

“sideboards” or legal requirements under which refuges must operate, with detailed reference to the “National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997.”

This presentation was followed by Refuge Planner Eric Nelson, who gave a summary of 12 public meetings held in August and September 2002 where citizens expressed hundreds of concerns “about the future management of the refuge.” These many concerns were then consolidated into 12 issues that “Manager for Day” participants were asked to address. The issues were printed as one-page “Issue Fact Sheets” that provided background materials and several “major concerns” citizens and staff had expressed about each issue.

The facilitators then began the workshop process by randomly assigning participants to working groups of 6-8 people. The groups each selected 5 of 12 “Fact Sheet” issues that they would address throughout the day. They could add more issues if desired. The exception to this procedure was at Prairie du Chien WI where participants addressed 11 of 12 “Fact Sheet” issues and added others. Groups selected their top five issues for discussion by having each participant place up to 5 “sticky dots” next to his or her highest priority issue written on flip charts. Each working group selected its own facilitator, presenter, recorder, and timekeeper. All concerns, notes, and solutions were entered into laptop computers by refuge staff. At day’s end, presenters for each group told the entire workshop their concerns and

“potential solutions” to issues they had selected. Participants were encouraged to listen carefully, know that all opinions were valid, respect each other, not allow one person dominate, and recognize that differences of opinion would be voiced but not necessarily resolved at the workshop.

A Note about the Issues

Workshops held at Prairie du Chien WI, Savanna IL, Winona MN, Onalaska WI, and UW-La

Crosse all dealt with the same basic 12 issues related to the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge. Workshops at Elkader and Trempealeau each had issues specific to Driftless Area NWR and Trempealeau NWR, respectively.

Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge

HABITAT ISSUES – Part 1 of 3

Statements are preceded by one of 5 letters listed below that correspond to the workshop city in which the statement was made.

O = Onalaska, P = Prairie du Chien,
S = Savanna, W = Winona,
and I = Interagency Team (UW-La Crosse)

1. The Issue: Management of Closed Areas *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

Main Concerns *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

- 1) Just as the river’s character has changed, so has the amount and quality of waterfowl habitat found in closed areas. *[Added at Wkshp I: “Habitats have declined significantly.”]* As a result, not all closed areas in the system are providing waterfowl with the habitat components required to meet their biological needs. Waterfowl are now concentrated in a few functioning closed areas rather than being dispersed throughout the system.
- 2) A significant percentage of the continental canvasback population concentrates annually in closed areas located on Pools 7-9. The availability and quality of habitat located on former off-river staging areas have contributed to this increased use, but so has the decline in habitat within the closed area system, such as the Weaver Bottoms Closed Area (Pool 5).

- 3) Fewer puddle ducks are using closed areas now compared with the early years of the system.
- 4) Habitat projects aimed at restoring fishery habitat within closed areas may result in more human use, which could lead to increased disturbance to waterfowl concentrated during fall migration.
- 5) At times, waterfowl hunters concentrate along sections of closed area boundary. The quality of the hunting experience may be lessened in areas where this occurs as waterfowlers compete for prime locations. Other characteristics of firing lines include crowding and excessive “skybusting,” which can result in an increase in the number of unretrieved birds.
- 6) *[Added at Wkshp P]* The goal of closed areas should be to provide habitat for both puddle ducks and diving ducks throughout the length of the Refuge.
- 7) *[Added at Wkshp S]* Habitat within closed area has degraded, possibly affecting waterfowl migration patterns.
- 8) *[Added at Wkshp S]* Too many closed areas, reduce number of closed areas, buffer zone.
- 9) *[Added at Wkshp S]* More funding to manage hunting opportunities.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Closed areas are few and far between.
- 2) W--Some open areas act as closed areas due to lack of vegetation - open water.
- 3) W--Closed areas should be closed to all activity.
- 4) W--Consider reorganizing closed areas - eliminate boating lanes into and out of boat harbors, for example.
- 5) W--UMRCC – wildlife tech session recommended re-evaluating closed areas.
- 6) W--Firing lines are a fact of life - hard to eliminate.
- 7) W--Need to balance in accessibility for hunters and accessibility for waterfowl to food.
- 8) W--Provide flexibility in location and distribution of the closed areas.
- 9) W--Airboats very disturbing and destructive.
- 10) W--Managers need flexibility in being able to change usage with appropriate public input.
- 11) W--Closed areas provide a model for segmented management with public input.
- 12) W--Current closed are not meeting not meeting the needs of waterfowl hunters or waterfowl.
- 13) W--Habitat is changing and we need to determine where the best habitat is located. We need to analyze habitat for particular species.
- 14) W--Degradation of habitat in current closed areas does not permit adequate protection of waterfowl species.
- 15) W--System of locating and changing closed areas is too rigid.
- 16) W--The placement of closed areas in the lower reaches of Upper Miss. is too spread out, not allowing adequate resting and feeding areas for waterfowl.
- 17) W--Firing lines are a major problem on some portions of the Refuge.
- 18) P--There is need for continuous research and resulting recommendations on how best to manage closed areas by the FWS.
- 19) I--How do we convey the need for expansion in closed areas to the public?

The fact sheet does not contain good justification for expansion or dispersal of migrating waterfowl. Public perceive change as bad.

- 20) I--How do we engage the “silent majority”?
- 21) I--How do closed areas (no hunting zones) fit into management for other public use (i.e., hiking/biking)?
- 22) I--Habitat restoration within closed areas should not be limited to benefits for migratory bird spp.; consideration should be of entire ecosystem values.

W--Position Statement: Flexibility is needed in the location, distribution and size of closed areas on the UMR. FWS should consider UMRCC wildlife tech. Sections recommendations. A balance is needed between accessibility of closed areas to hunters, boaters and anglers and waterfowls need for food and resting areas. A survey should be completed to show what percentage of the Refuge is open to hunting and areas where hunting is not permitted (closed areas, open water).

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--Educate the public on the current status of closed areas and suitability to provide feeding and resting areas for waterfowl.
- 2) W--Re-evaluate the suitability and distribution of closed areas on the UMR. Consider both hunter and waterfowl needs. (Boating through to get to hunting or fishing areas.)
- 3) W--Investigate the need for additional voluntary avoidance areas during the waterfowl season.
- 4) W--Expansion of voluntary avoidance areas for specific species management within closed areas and possibly in areas outside of closed areas. Public education will be an essential component of achieving voluntary avoidance (Kiosks,

- regulations, signs, news releases, talks to sportsmen's groups, etc.).
- 5) W--Development of comprehensive and ongoing research including funding and staff to evaluate the effectiveness of closed areas.
 - 6) W--Inter-pool closed area shifts with no net loss of closed/open areas to respond to habitat changes.
 - 7) W--Establish mandatory hunting locations along firing lines ensuring adequate spacing and hunter density for safety and waterfowl population protection in problem areas.
 - 8) O--Hunting – have a limit on shells per hunter each day to reduce skybusting.
 - 9) O--Review closed area designations periodically for viability.
 - 10) O--Expand voluntary avoidance area program.
 - 11) O--Clear and defined closed area boundaries that are well marked and recognizable. Maps should be available online.
 - 12) P--Review closed area boundaries.
 - 13) P--FWS develop changes consistent with guidelines.
 - 14) P--Implement changes.
 - 15) S--Periodically rotate closed areas, taking into account that the Depot is a de facto closed area. Rotation will move ducks around during the course of the season, and may keep them from imprinting on a particular closed area.
 - 16) S--Create additional closed areas, so that present closed areas can periodically be opened, but total closed area will remain the same.
 - 17) S--Flexible boundaries: can have more one year, less another, depending on the habitat needs.
 - 18) S--Open more areas (if you have 1,000 acres closed, open somewhere else).
 - 19) S--Duplicate successful (Model) habitat in other pools.
 - 20) S--Reduce speed limits of boats.
 - 21) S--Create managed hunting zone within closed areas.

- 22) S--Seek more funding from other sources.
- 23) I--Use data to identify closed area needs.
- 24) I--Look at global populations
- 25) I--Distribute waterfowl throughout Refuge – to do this we need to improve habitat in other pools that aren't holding waterfowl.
- 26) I--Educate public on importance of closed areas, and role disturbance plays in reducing the value of these areas to waterbirds.
- 27) I--Increase the distribution of quality areas.

2. The Issue: Habitat Protection/ Enhancement

[Added at Wkshp O]

Main Concerns

- 1) Need adequate funding.
- 2) Island erosion/bank erosion.
- 3) Need to evaluate effectiveness of the closed areas.
- 4) Maintain and improve the productivity of the habitat.
- 5) Increase diversity of habitat available across the Refuge.
- 6) Loss of forests on the Refuge.
- 7) Lack of control of invasive species, need more research.
- 8) Manage for native species, need more research.
- 9) Need public education.
- 10) Water level management conflicts; stabilizing has a negative impact.
- 11) Problem of barges tying off at unauthorized sites (improper barge fleeting).
- 12) Loss of islands.
- 13) Lack of selective dredging to improve habitat.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) Shorebird habitat creation – want to see it continued. Creation and restoration should be a priority not a secondary issue.
- 2) If refuge purpose is for wildlife, then preservation and protection and restoration of habitat should be # 1.

- 3) Sediment effects on habitat. Backwaters are filling in.
- 4) Flood plain forest – unchecked beaver populations have hurt forests. Water table may have risen and killed trees.
- 5) Enhance existing marshes & grasslands.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Increase reforestation of backwater islands with native hardwoods.
- 2) Establish and maintain grass and herbaceous cover, including prairie habitat.
- 3) Cooperate with COE to improve habitat.
- 4) Encourage continued STRONG EMP funding.
- 5) Expand island creation and dredging appropriately in backwaters.
- 6) Increase funding and research to manage for native species and control invasive species.
- 7) Stop encroachment on Refuge lands (i.e. airport expansion).
- 8) Work with appropriate jurisdictions to establish appropriate zoning and land use practices.
- 9) Educate public about value of the habitat.
- 10) Expand water level management program to mimic the natural riverine processes (flushing, summer drawdowns).
- 11) Work with the COE to reduce the daily water level fluctuations.
- 12) Require barges to tie up at designated sites.
- 13) Do not increase navigation channel beyond the 9-foot minimum.
- 14) Limit the length and draft of barges.
- 15) Give equal weight to wildlife and navigation in decision-making and budget authority.
- 16) Get Congress to give more money – friends groups, volunteers, other partners to lobby Congress.
- 17) Use local groups to get funds for local habitat improvement projects. (DU, Turkey Federation Trout unlimited etc.).
- 18) Feds need to prioritize regional projects so \$\$\$ is better spent.
- 19) Emphasize local benefits to get more local support.
- 20) Create user fee for river users (like bike trail pass). Marine gas tax, charge for boat launching.
- 21) Sportsmen pay through licenses, stamps & tax on gear. Other users may not currently pay for access.
- 22) Do research to prioritize projects – research will support which projects to undertake on a regional basis.
- 23) Get barge companies to pay for habitat not just L&D operation (earmark portion of fuel tax for habitat).
- 24) Do some research to determine what is the most threatened to prioritize where to spend limited funds.
- 25) Sedimentation is a huge issue – need to find ways to reduce sedimentation. Focus on what we can do to control sedimentation.
- 26) Work with other agencies to try to stop sedimentation before it gets to the river. Educate people to help reduce off river causes of sedimentation. Need more point source controls.
- 27) Remove or thin stands to encourage native plants. Replant trees where possible. Maybe prescribed burns to restore grasslands and marshes.
- 28) Consider building dikes or other structures according to site needs.
- 29) Don't build dikes or structures that look out of place – make structures flood compatible. So floods don't wash them out and they don't change river flows or cause more erosion or sedimentation.

3. The Issue: Habitat Restoration

[Added at Wkshp S]

Main Concerns

- 1) Too much sedimentation.
- 2) Loss of grassland habitat.
- 3) Deterioration of native forest quality.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Work with Corps of Engineers in timely fashion to implement water drawdowns.
- 2) Management of entire watershed; create or increase incentives for private landowners.
- 3) Disconnect wing dams from shore.
- 4) Wetland restoration.
- 5) Prairie restoration.
- 6) 50,000 acres of grasslands to be added.
- 7) Woodland restoration.
- 8) Planting and protection of native hardwoods.
- 9) Reintroduction of fire (woodland burns).

4. The Issue: Near Shore Aquatic Habitat Management *[Added at Wkshp I]*

(Refers to littoral zone – shallow and productive habitats and riparian buffer zones where terrestrial transition zone exists.)

Main Concerns

- 1) People often eliminate “obstructive” and “trashy” vegetation in these areas to “clear the view.”
- 2) Relates back to educational need. Relates to island and bank erosion issue.
- 3) Need more demonstration areas where natural vegetation is encouraged.
- 4) Need more management options for shore stabilization and best management practices to protect habitats from loss or alteration and to restore habitat diversity.
- 5) Dealing with root sources and causes of flooding and sedimentation.
- 6) Bigger boats demanding access to backwaters; need for protected areas to drop out suspended sediments and to process nutrients or other contaminants.

Potential Solutions

(Pertain to both terrestrial and aquatic habitat management.) (One of our groups repeated their Main Concerns as their Potential Solutions, shown below.)

- 1) Habitat diversity may even be enhanced with riprap if sufficiently limited.

- 2) More demonstration areas where natural vegetation is encouraged.
- 3) More management options for shore stabilization and best management practices to protect habitats from loss or alteration and to restore habitat diversity.
- 4) Deal with root sources and causes of flooding and sedimentation.
- 5) Create protected areas to drop out suspended sediments and to process nutrients or other contaminants.

5. The Issue: Terrestrial Vegetation Habitat Management *[Added at Wkshp I]*

The other elements are aquatic vegetation oriented, not so much near shore areas relating to buffer zones not only on the river but up tributaries and throughout watersheds. These serve as breeding areas and nurseries for a variety of fish and wildlife species.

Main Concerns

- 1) Habitat quality may be declining even faster in some areas than habitat quantity.
- 2) Dealing with altered ecosystem: many impacts besides navigation impacts – dealing with new successional situations and meeting evolving needs require intensive management. Can’t return to original conditions; have to deal with new river every year.
- 3) Doing nothing is not really an option, although some areas need to be set aside for research and control areas. ES may require intervention in natural areas.
- 4) Reed canary grass is example of management being too little.
- 5) FWS management is conditioned to have big brother federal agencies or states do bulk of the management “heavy lifting”; we belong to the school of getting along and thinking small. Need to go back to “the school of big thinking.” Future management will require it.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Elevate the priority placed on habitat management for funding and staffing purposes.
- 2) Pool plans need to connect better with off-river watershed planning and part of CCP.
- 3) Plug into basin alliances and watershed partnerships to inform them on ways to support the objectives and address the needs set forth for river management.
- 4) Improved interagency, public/private communication and coordination off-refuge.
- 5) Research to support management strategies; distribute results to resource people.
- 6) Study effects of habitat loss and effectiveness of best management practices.
- 7) Study successional trends of altered/disturbed ecosystems from short to very long-term.
- 8) Look for opportunities to coordinate and cooperate with forest mgt. groups/universities.
- 9) Educational programs to see and understand habitat function and importance (values).
- 10) Implement UMRCC Floodplain Forest Management Doc. (Recommended Actions).
- 11) Implement recommendations of Pool Plans as soon as they are finalized.
- 12) Permit holder education and information outreach to explain standards and values.
- 13) Research and identify specific causes of shoreline erosion; create no-wake zones or no motor access zones for backwater protection – appropriate kinds/amounts/speeds of use.
- 14) Support watershed management through off-river partnerships, via strengthened Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program assistance to reduce riparian erosion and refuge impacts; work with other agencies and programs to increase education; technical assistance; monitoring and cost-sharing for specific cooperative projects.
- 15) Increase work with COE on structural solutions including barriers, islands, chutes, etc. also seed islands, breakwaters to reduce wave action and many other techniques.
- 16) Use more natural alternatives to riprap and other stabilization methods.
- 17) More interagency coordination on regulation, permits, recreational uses, acquisition to protect areas on the refuge and easements or other methods for land use controls or buffers off the Refuge.

6. The Issue: Impacts from Adjacent Lands [Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns [Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

- 1) Most of the programs and resources necessary for successful private lands conservation are scattered among other agencies and organizations. There is a lack of coordination to ensure that water quality and habitat concerns are fully addressed in land use decisions. *[Modified at Wkshp P to read: “Private lands programs are scattered among agencies resulting in lack of coordination.”]*
- 2) Decision support information and tools making it possible to inventory, map, track and prioritize critical areas for habitat restoration and water quality enhancement are now readily available, but few people know how that can be accessed. *[Modified at Wkshp P to read: “Need better definition of impacts both local and or systemic, the FWS and the public need to prioritize such impacts and provide dollars to actively solve high priority issues.”]*
- 3) The USFWS Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, which began in the mid-1980s, assists landowners in cooperation with other agencies and organizations *[Modified at Wkshp P inserting “in conjunction with local governments”]*, but current refuge and staff and funding are inadequate to provide districts additional

dedicated staff positions for outreach, technical assistance and coordination.

- 4) S--Encourage farm service agencies to work with landowners on erosion prevention measures.
- 5) S--Become more pro-active about impact from adjacent lands, rather than reactive.
- 6) S--More money needs to be spent on land conservation programs.
- 7) S--Allocate money to local conservation agencies able to influence impacts in the watershed.
- 8) S--Acquisition of land, or of conservation easements when land acquisition is either infeasible or too expensive.
- 9) S--Advocate for upgrade of municipal sewage systems, not only on the river, but also along tributaries.
- 10) I--How neighbors are treating lands – consciousness of refuge proximity or downriver awareness.
- 11) I--Exclusive private use – intentional or unintentional - of public lands and resources.
- 12) I--Development of riparian areas, zoning and standards for impacts that are adjacent or distant. Federal, State and Local improvements in coordination and jurisdictional cooperation needed.
- 13) I--Navigation and other adjacent uses. Elevating purpose of main channel to bring about more funding and focus (see modified issue statement above). Habitat, recreation values brought together for Congress as part of impact analysis.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Sediment is a main impact from adjacent lands. Lack of ability to work in a team fashion to deal with the problem.
- 2) W--Lack of enforcement and coordination.
- 3) W--Neighboring property owner's uses or impacts to the Refuge: lawn pesticides, riprap, vegetation removal. Need to maintain natural vegetation buffers.
- 4) W--Boathouse owners. Garbage strewn about the boat grounds.

- 5) W--Private use of public resource lands by private, adjacent landowners. Problem ranges from watershed wide to very local persons.
- 6) W--Define/classify impact of surrounding/adjacent uses.
- 7) W--Other government agencies deal with off Refuge land management.
- 8) W--Barge fleeting area in Winona (expansion concerns).
- 9) O--Refuge is being impacted to a greater extent by adjacent lands.
- 10) O--Urban growth and associated land use changes are having a significant impact on the Refuge because of the current level of land use regulation.
- 11) O--Sedimentation is the major problem on the Refuge.
- 12) O--Industrial and agricultural runoff.
- 13) O--Excessive nutrients.
- 14) O--Lack of proactive protection for the Refuge – off-site development.
- 15) O--Agencies and adjacent land owners (jurisdiction) need to cooperate and be active in deciding if uses are compatible with the Refuge.
- 16) O--Need for better coordination between state and federal agencies.
- 17) I--Importance of on-refuge and off-refuge processing of excess runoff, floodwaters, sediment, industrial, residential and commercial contaminants and nutrients. (Land use and water quality.)
- 18) I--Catastrophic impact anticipation, planning, prevention, mitigation and response. Ranging from “natural disasters” to human-caused accidents, to deliberate “terrorist acts.” (Precautionary Prin.)
- 19) I--Two types of neighbors. Those in direct proximity as opposed to those remotely located up watersheds. Stealing firewood and encroaching in other ways as opposed to distant impacts.
- 20) I--May need to define impacts of “use” on immediately adjacent lands as separate; Provide more focus on impacts from urbanization and development

immediately adjacent to refuge boundary; (i.e., roads, residences, industrial and commercial development, airports); *use* is the main issue

- 21) I--Change title of this sheet to reflect *watershed* impacts to refuge lands.

W--Position Statement: In order to better understand and enforce the impact from “Adjacent” lands a more clear understanding of the areas considered to be adjacent should be outlined. A need to put and emphasis on those issues that directly affect the Refuge like barge staging areas, boathouses, and sediment movement. This can be done most effectively through coordination from different agencies and public input. An emphasis needs to be placed on enforcement.

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--Encourage existing programs to address off-Refuge land use issues that impact the UMR.
- 2) W--Clarify what adjacent lands are and classify according to impacts.
Class 1: Bordering lands: Lands physically touching the Refuge.
Class 2: Bordering tributaries.
Class 3: Watershed.
- 3) W--Establish a liaison to work with private land owners and conservation groups to ensure Mississippi River receives priority consideration.
- 4) W--Encourage adjacent landowners to maintain vegetation buffers next to Refuge property.
- 5) W--Work towards consistency amongst agencies.
- 6) W--Eliminate private use of public property-boat houses.
- 7) W--Education on chemical use in watershed. Educate adjacent landowners on the use of pesticides and potential impacts to Refuge.
- 8) O--Purchase key lands based on habitat needs.
- 9) O--Work with adjacent landowners and governments to reduce impacts from adjacent land.
- 10) O--Offer financial and technical assistance to adjacent private landowners.
- 11) O--Promote importance of the Refuge to the local economy.
- 12) O--Work with advocacy groups to promote the importance of the Refuge.
- 13) O--Take the time to get to know the adjacent landowners.
- 14) O--Proactive collaboration with adjoining jurisdictions (federal, state, local, landowners, public).
- 15) O--Increase, promote, and improve public education.
 - Broaden your audience to reach new and different people.
 - Use membership groups to target your audience, i.e. lake associations, civic groups, hunting groups, schools, tourists, landowners.
 - Environmental education programs in and outside schools.
 - Improve monitoring and law enforcement.
 - Increase buffer zones.
 - Create a comprehensive plan for the Upper Miss River watershed that analyzes and addresses cumulative impacts.
- 16) O--Utilize recommendations from comprehensive plans and advocate enabling legislation.
- 17) S--Chemical application.
- 18) S--Refer to siltation [issue added by one group].
- 19) S--Encourage farm service agencies to work with landowners on erosion prevention measures.
- 20) S--Become more pro-active about impact from adjacent lands, rather than reactive.
- 21) S--More money needs to be spent on land conservation programs.
- 22) S--Allocate money to local conservation agencies able to influence impacts in the watershed.

- 23) S--Acquisition of land, or of conservation easements, when land acquisition is either infeasible or too expensive.
- 24) S--Advocate for upgrade of municipal sewage systems, not only on the river but along tributaries.
- 25) P--Implement Main Concern #2 above.
- 26) P--Implement cooperative agency committee to address issue.
- 27) P--Purchase key parcels that would assist in alleviating / reducing off refuge problems.
- 28) P--Request adequate funding and authority for refuge staff to establish formal agreements with local governments for land use changes.
- 29) I--Identify existing organizations participating and showing leadership in conservation work and build on those; improve coordination between groups; encourage and participate in existing projects and groups rather than starting new ones;
- 30) I--Write a watershed management plan for the refuge (including tributaries); USFWS should take the lead; also include NRCS, States, EPA and other involved agencies; need to bring local projects under an umbrella organization like River Resources Forum or basin associations or "watershed coordination group"; need federal oversight and funding to coordinate watershed efforts; NRCS should be a bigger player.
- 31) I--Refuge should become involved in "local" land use planning at county, city levels.
- 32) I--Support watershed management through off-river partnerships, via strengthened Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program assistance to reduce riparian erosion and refuge impacts; work with other agencies and programs to increase education; technical assistance; monitoring and cost-sharing for specific cooperative projects.
- 33) I--Participate in planning at various levels and scales to assure that refuge needs are represented in regional, community and interagency planning and cooperative management.
- 34) I--Elevating purpose and policy projection of fish and wildlife habitat protection and restoration to better integrate with navigation project, agriculture, development, etc. driven by other agencies.
- 35) I--Confusion from dealing with multiple COE districts; possible congressional action to modify mandated purpose, to increase consistency among COE districts, etc. Via influential contacts??
- 36) I--Specific "project purposes" on UMR of COE need to reference habitat (or "Ecosystem Mgt.") Work with COE to get grassroots support to add this to 9-foot channel project purpose.
- 37) I--Increase policy-level coordination with other off-river agencies, such as NRCS, to support similar adoption of habitat priorities within new Farm Bill initiatives such as the CREP and CSP.
- 38) I--Advisors, facilitators, consultants needed at the landscape scale to assure that USDA agencies have needed technical assistance in targeting assistance and practice implementation. This implies additional staff and funding through refuge districts for Private Lands outreach.
- 39) I--Use available knowledge derived from Pool Plans and other available documents prioritizing critical areas for habitat restoration and water quality enhancement.
- 40) I--Additional GIS capabilities needed to handle data throughput.
- 41) I--More aggressive education and enforcement, when it fails. FWS comments, but refuge doesn't, on permit suitability from a management perspective, not just ES concerns. Staff evaluating permits needs to be more in tune with management concerns of the refuge. This applies also to feedlot permits, which do not even receive review and comment, as well as development permit, which can also significantly impact the refuge. Sensitive areas

potentially very vulnerable, including sink holes, springs, algific slopes, tributary backwaters near confluence with UMR.

- 42) I--Examples: housing developments, airports, commercial and industrial, smart growth. Need more input through coordination groups, such as basin alliances. Local, ongoing best approach, but incredibly staff and time intensive.
- 43) I--Match up COE and FWS rules for consistency; what's good for refuge also good for COE lands.
- 44) I--FWS natural edges; COE edges are manicured, often in areas that don't need it. Coordination! Make sure the focus remains on habitat quality and minimizing intrusion, exclusive use.

7. The Issue: Invasive Species

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns [Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

- 1) The present distribution and rate of spread of the various invasive species throughout Refuge habitats has not been (*Revised at Wkshp P to add: "adequately"*) documented.
 - 2) There are no known control mechanisms for zebra mussels. The relationship between pool drawdowns and zebra mussels has not been documented. [*Revised at Wkshp P to read: "There are no known control mechanisms for many invasive species."*]
 - 3) Mechanical, chemical and biological control techniques for species such as European buckthorn, reed canary grass and leafy spurge have achieved varying degrees of success.
 - 4) Major funding is lacking if existing Refuge resources are to be diverted from ongoing programs to control of exotics.
 - 5) What is the long-term prediction for the future make-up of aquatic habitats if we do nothing? Will native mussels be wiped out? Will improvements in water quality from zebra mussel filtering offset other losses? [*Revised at Wkshp P to read: "Do*
- specific invasive species help improve some problems, e.g., zebra mussels and water quality?"]
 - 6) [*Added at Wkshp S*] Long-term prediction for the future make-up of aquatic habitats and native species.
 - 7) [*Added at Wkshp S*] Over-emphasis of water invasive species at the expense of land invasive species.
 - 8) [*Added at Wkshp I*] Invasives not dealt with soon enough. Too late when major problem has manifested. Need better anticipation and response before problems become intractable.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Public education (what, who, why, when and where).
- 2) W--What can a general citizen do?
- 3) W--Control vs. expense.
- 4) W--Introduction of exotics to control exotics.
- 5) W--Will the P.L. beetles become a problem?
- 6) W--No Federal regulation on imported species.
- 7) W--Invasive species is #1 concern. Widespread issue across the landscape.
- 8) W--Need to look at benefits and costs associated with releasing biological control agents.
- 9) O--Almost all Federal agencies are ignoring invasive species, which is currently not a priority and it needs to be. Also includes other government bodies.
- 10) O--Little or no regulation of imports. We are still bringing in invasive species. Need to educate and fund control measures.
- 11) I--Not all non-natives are invasive. Could spend money trying to control something that doesn't need it. Not all are controllable either, no matter how much money you throw at them.
- 12) I--Education is an issue in either case.
- 13) I--How to maximize habitat values of areas that have been "taken over"? Need research to determine whether constructive

use can be made of infested or heavily impacted areas.

- 14) I--More research needed in general on spread rates, biological controls, risks etc.
- 15) I--Exotic species may affect the decision making process for ecosystem management. The technique may not be implemented due to concerns of hastening the spread of exotics (i.e., Fish passage).
- 16) I--The USFWS should be the lead in invasive species control but is hampered by politics.

W--Position Statement: Because there are many questions about invasive species, the need for education including what they are; where they are found; and what can citizens do to aid in control, needs attention. The issue is widespread across the landscape and there is concern that in some cases the control agent may be as bad as the thing being controlled. Concern also about the effectiveness of federal regulations on imported species.

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--Need for tighter Federal regulations controlling introductions of imported species.
- 2) W--Educate the public on what invasive species are, why they are a cause for concern, and what individuals can do to prevent their spread.
- 3) W--Place more emphasis on invasive species control and secure funding.
- 4) W--Increase monitoring/ survey of distribution and rate of spread of invasive species.
- 5) W--Work closely with other agencies/universities that are working on invasive species control.
- 6) W--Use of fire to control buckthorn and other fire sensitive species.
- 7) O--Regulations and education are needed due to threats on native species.
- 8) O--Research into different control methods are needed.
- 9) O--Inter-agency cooperation is needed to prohibit sales of invasive species.
- 10) O--Better regulations and or enforcement in selling species.
- 11) O--Spend more \$\$\$ to do on ground control measures.
- 12) O--Use local work groups to control (pull weeds, etc.).
- 13) O--Not all research used for management.
- 14) O--Public not all aware of the presence of invasive species, better education in schools.
- 15) O--Better research for control methods.
- 16) O--Need to Focus on WORST species, those presenting greatest threat and manpower and dollars.
- 17) O--Guard against new invasives.
- 18) O--Preserve and reintroduce native species.
- 19) P--Adequately document the present distribution and rate of spread of the various invasive species throughout the Refuge.
- 20) P--Support and recommend research to develop controls of invasive species.
- 21) P--Develop budget needs to implement control on specific species.
- 22) P--Support long term monitoring (EMP) of environmental changes due to invasive species, with or without controls.
- 23) S--Further research on ecology of the invasive species.
- 24) S--Research by other entities.
- 25) S--Find answer through research.
- 26) S--Find successful technique before spending money on questionable techniques.
- 27) S--Divert personnel from other activities.
- 28) S--Acquire additional personnel, specialists to work on solution. Not funded by FWS. Science foundation, interest groups.
- 29) S--Research and control.
- 30) S--Keep appropriate balance and funding to avoid over-emphasis of water invasive species at the expense of land invasive species.
- 31) I--Outreach to public and the legislators.
- 32) I--Only plant natives.

- 33) I--Target invasive species we can do something about.
- 34) I--Educate public and not bring in any new ones.
- 35) I--Learn how to manage with the ones we have and keep them from spreading,
- 36) I--Work with private landowners to help with control.
- 37) I--Keep tabs on new species arriving via IL River, quick for surveys and action plans.
- 38) I--Educate public on various means of transport and spread.
- 39) I--Research must precede control strategies i.e. species that can be use invasives-dominated habitats? We are the first and the worst non-native invader.
- 40) I--Propose additional funding for invasive species.

8. The Issue: Island and Bank Erosion

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns [Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

- 1) Loss off riverine islands and shorelines has resulted in significant loss of floodplain habitat on the UMR.
- 2) Some believe that islands should be built where they once existed, and in a manner that duplicates natural islands. However, actual habitat needs often call for islands that may look somewhat unnatural and be in strategic vs. original locations.
- 3) The Fish and Wildlife Service does not receive funding specifically for maintenance of constructed islands or their restoration after flooding. Thus, some islands do not provide the full extent of habitat benefits as originally planned or intended.
- 4) [Added at Wkshp W] Concern that islands are only made from dredge spoil.
- 5) [Added at Wkshp W] Deep water habitat should be a part of island construction.
- 6) [Added at Wkshp W] Protection of existing islands.
- 7) [Added at Wkshp W] Seed islands and islands that develop as a result of water level management should be encouraged and a priority along with construction islands.
- 8) [Added at Wkshp P] Water level management benefits are greatly enhanced where islands are placed to provide structure for aquatic vegetation to grow and expand.
- 9) [Added at Wkshp P] Protection of key existing islands threatened by erosion which results in island forest and wetland habitat and habitat loss.”
- 10) [Added at Wkshp S] Concern with channelizing by dikes/levee/wing dams.
- 11) [Added at Wkshp S] Habitat first, recreation second.
- 12) [Added at Wkshp S] FWS should take a stand on L&D expansion.
- 13) [Added at Wkshp S] Corps’ agenda will take precedence over FWS.
- 14) [Added at Wkshp S] Funding is not equal between Corps and FWS, with FWS getting short share, and other conservation agencies.
- 15) [Added at Wkshp S] Islands, banks and siltation all have these solutions; combine two issues.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Lack of education about the history of the riverine system.
- 2) W--Recreational boats wakes are a major cause of bank erosion.
- 3) W--Public is uneducated about the need for protection of vital areas on the River (e.g., rip-rap).
- 4) O--Once the shorelines are lost – more sediment comes in.
- 5) O--Need to maintain and recreate islands to keep the river flowing – can reduce dredging needs by keeping the water confined, or create habitat by braided islands also.
- 6) O--Wakes from pleasure boats are a big issue.
- 7) O--Get back to the “original” dynamics – make it like it was 40 years ago.

- 8) O--Make it look more natural – rip rap islands with flat tops do not look natural.
- 9) I--Does not make reference to areas where islands are re-forming naturally; may be ways to encourage natural process of reformation.
- 10) I--Public may not perceive newly formed island as beneficial; often perceived as sedimentation.
- 11) I--Loss of backwater depth diversity.
- 12) I--Re-title issue to “habitat loss” to include all other habitats on river (i.e., backwaters).
- 13) I--Change wording in concern #2 to say “some believe” actual habitat needs often; natural or unnatural islands may be appropriate; we should restore habitat one way or another using our best scientific judgment; whether they are natural or unnatural is a public perception problem.

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--Education of public of history of riverine system to increase public awareness of need for protection of vital areas.
- 2) W--Increase public awareness of boat wake erosion effects and voluntary use avoidance areas.
- 3) W--Follow through management of critical areas to include funding and resources.
- 4) W--Continue building of these islands, some in strategic locations, some not.
- 5) W--Maintain/Protect higher elevation land features with offshore protection and allow low elevation features to erode and subsequently redeposit, additionally allow for sediment transport and consequent development of low level islands associated with WLM.
- 6) W--Support pool planning process.
- 7) W--Explore weight restrictions during times of high water levels to curb island and bank erosion.
- 8) O--Aesthetics and spiritual issues should be important.
- 9) O--Make rip rap look more natural.
- 10) O--Use new materials that look better but do the same job. Plant willows & place logs at the shoreline.
- 11) O--Plant trees, shrubs, grass or creeping vines to camouflage the rip rap.
- 12) O--Make boat wake/speed restrictions. Especially where shorelines are eroding and there is no current funding to improve them.
- 13) O--Duplicate island structures from the 50s & 60s.
- 14) O--Place top soil on selected areas on rip rap and plant to grass or trees to hide the rock.
- 15) P--See Potential Solutions for Resident Species Mgmt. Issue.
- 16) P--Implement water level management.
- 17) P--Rip-rap or otherwise protect all or part of key islands.
- 18) P--Promote protection through EMP.
- 19) P--Support additional FWS money for maintenance of constructed and key existing islands.
- 20) P--Develop strategies through public involvement to minimize boat wake erosion.
- 21) P--Create voluntary boater avoidance areas.
- 22) S--Rip/Rap existing islands and vegetation with mast tree/raised island.
- 23) S--Reduce wake height on all boaters including barges.
- 24) S--FWS work with other conservation and local alliances to reduce silt.
- 25) S--Let people help FWS “let us know what you need, we’ll help,” (e.g., congressional contacts).
- 26) S--FWS needs to have more say in the way dredging is done on the Refuge system, which the Corps owns but FWS manages.
- 27) S--Have a wish list to horsetrade with Corps before consenting to accept bigger locks.
- 28) S--Find an old rock quarry or a landfill to place all the sand and all that comes from dredging; don’t buy something from Corps that they have to get rid of anyway.

- 29) S--Eliminate river disposal/thalwagging; do not dump sand back in the river. Take the sand and build an island out of it and/or restore and maintain islands.
- 30) S--Conduct research into historic conditions and into potential future changes to habitat if erosion is not adequately controlled.
- 31) S--Study cormorant impacts on island vegetation.
- 32) S--Increase funding for dredging practices to rebuild habitat and island.
- 33) S--Collect user fees for all users that utilize the Refuges. Reciprocity with other states.
- 34) S--Collect user fees for all users on the Upper Mississippi Refuge.
- 35) S--Create or include user fee from National Park Service and make sure that funding is increased and directed to the NWR.
- 36) S--Moratorium on dike building.
- 37) S--Funding directed towards habitat first, recreation second.
- 38) I--Implement pool plans following recommendations laid out in UMRCC document on pool plan implementation.
- 39) I--Work with EMP.
- 40) I--Secure funding from other sources for habitat restoration (i.e., NAWP Joint Venture, NAWCA).
- 41) I--Develop partnerships to cost share on projects.
- 42) I--Fund LTRMP to insure adaptive management based on best science.
- 43) I--Implement public education program about habitat loss issues and management actions.

9. The Issue: Management of Native Species *[Added at Wkshp O]*

Main Issues

- 1) Native species are an important component of the natural history of the UMR backwaters

- 2) Public use of the river for wildlife based recreation depends in part on these species and their habitat.
- 3) Issues are closely linked to those described under island and bank erosion.
- 4) This issue needs to be evaluated to a higher status in the planning process.
- 5) Deterioration of floodplain forests (Cottonwoods, oaks).
- 6) Grassland nesting species of Song Birds, Mallards, etc.
- 7) Spawning Areas for Fish.
- 8) Maintaining Marsh Habitat:
- 9) Maintain Deep Backwater Sloughs.
- 10) Deterioration of bottomland floodplain and grassland nesting habitat.
- 11) Loss of native plants makes it easier for invaders to start.
- 12) Loss of fish spawning areas and backwaters.
- 13) Loss of winter habitat for native fish.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Do applied research in terms of cause and effect relationship of loss or deterioration of habitat for native species.
- 2) Provide incentive for coordination of habitat management of private lands adjacent to the refuge.
- 3) Enhance native species management on refuge land. Develop a habitat management plan for each pool.
- 4) Use spoil to change root zone on islands by creating elevation variability.
- 5) Fire management of grasslands.
- 6) Create new grassland.
- 7) Improve/Create Spawning Marshes and dredging channels to these areas.
- 8) Create new isolated nesting islands.
- 9) Control predators through trapping.
- 10) Sediment traps on Creek/River entering the Miss.

10. The Issue: Management of Diversity of Species and Habitats

[Added at Wkshp I]

Main Concerns

- 1) Upper Mississippi River NWR are to provide a refuge and breeding place for migratory birds, other wild birds, game animals, fur-bearing animals, wildflowers, and aquatic plants, fish and other aquatic animal life. Management should be ecosystem based in keeping with the legislative mandate of the Refuge.
- 2) Not enough management – too compartmentalized on individual or group of species rather than diversity
- 3) Because of human impacted system we don't have a good idea of what should or shouldn't be there. We have no good idea of what the system would be without action.
- 4) Environmental pool plans should be a strong component for management action decision within CCP because the Environmental Pool Plan took a broader approach than single species or individual project.
- 5) Traditionally, scope of USFWS has been to manage for migratory and trust species. The move to more holistic ecosystem management is good.
- 6) An important task in management is to educate the public that any management efforts do benefit multiple species-at the same time, we can't meet the needs of all species everywhere at once.
- 7) To do this education we need to first understand how our actions impact other species
- 8) Need to make management decisions based on the needs of plants & animals. The human element should not drive this decision process. Manage human use separately.
- 9) What is the scale? This will determine what authority the USFWS will have.
- 10) Don't forego habitat improvement opportunities because of the potential

impacts by humans. Recent habitat project planning (i.e., HREP & EPP) has omitted habitat restoration measures because of potential human disturbance.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Develop and maintain a mosaic of habitats in the river.
- 2) Manage for a habitat system rather than single species such as bald eagles, Massasauga rattlesnakes.
- 3) Develop a template of conditions so if an area "wants" to be a wet meadow and the area fits the template that it could be managed for that habitat manage for that template of conditions.
- 4) Management actions (restoration) should consider all species for which site conditions would permit.
- 5) Manage for habitat types, not individual species, or group of species.
- 6) Manage for diversity without inducing fragmentation (this will be dependent on scale).
- 7) Identify research needs for characterizing habitat types, quantity of interspersions etc.
- 8) Restoration/Habitat management objectives should drive the project. Then address the human uses that may impact the habitat project.
- 9) Change wording of Closed Areas to Wildlife Protection Areas.

11. The Issue: Resident Species Management *[Added at Wkshp P]*

Main Concerns

- 1) The FWS needs to remain cognizant of the importance of surveying and managing resident species, both plants and animals that occur on the Refuge. This includes both breeding and migratory species.
- 2) Management should concentrate on habitat using keystone and/or guild species.
- 3) Habitat loss and degradation result in loss of floodplain forest, wetland and prairie grasslands.

- 4) Lack of understanding of hydrologic changes on resident species.

Potential Solutions

- 1) The FWS needs to remain cognizant of the importance of surveying and managing resident species, both plants and animals that occur on the Refuge.
- 2) Management should concentrate on habitat using keystone and/or guild species.
- 3) Return and develop topographic diversity to forest floodplain, including islands.

12. Sedimentation/Restoration [Added at Wkshp S]

Main Concerns

- 1) No connection with local soil offices.
- 2) Loss of wildlife habitat, food, nesting, etc.
- 3) Loss of recreational and commercial navigation.
- 4) Loss of fish habitat.
- 5) Lack of county involvement with federal FSA.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Procurement of funds for restoration of habitat.
- 2) Coordinate federal, state, and local programs to reduce erosion on surrounding land. Methods include: waterways, sediment retention ponds, buffer strips, conservation, tillage.
- 3) FWS should work with other government agencies and private landowners to encourage creation of buffer zones and other means of erosion control and soil conservation.
- 4) Dredge fish habitat on a regular cycle.
- 5) Dredge for boat access and traffic; mark the channel for recreational boating.

13. The Issue: Siltation

[Added at Wkshp S]

Main Concerns

- 1) Draining of farmland fields, tilling of farmland.
- 2) Fall chisel plow.

- 3) Land ownership against river; enforce conservation.
- 4) Voluntary process vs. mandatory.
- 5) Eroding plant life.
- 6) Mandatory that farmers follow some farm methods.
- 7) Water level management.
- 8) Cost.
- 9) How to control farming.
- 10) Main channel clean out.
- 11) Poor access to river.
- 12) Too much “dead” water, not enough circulation, not enough depth for over-wintering fish habitat. No natural flowage.
- 13) Lack of submergent vegetation, and excess emergent vegetation (e.g., lotus).

Potential Solutions

- 1) Incentives to promote conservation practices.
- 2) Eliminate draining and tilling.
- 3) Eliminate fall chisel plowing.
- 4) Create buffer zones on “all” waterways; reduce chemicals.
- 5) Coordinate State, local and Federal agencies to fund conservation practices.
- 6) Working relationship with Corps of Engineers for water level management and how it affects wildlife and plant life.
- 7) Dredge material could be used for islands for nesting habitat.
- 8) Dredge could also be used to build up dikes, make wider, prevent rat damage (Spring Lake only).

14. The Issue: Water Level Management of Navigation Pools (Drawdowns)

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns

- 1) Deeper, relatively stable water levels resulting from construction and operation of the 9-foot navigation project have significantly reduced the amount and quality of many plant *[Revised at Wkshp I]*

to add: “, fish, and mussel] communities and other habitats. This habitat loss has adversely affected fish and wildlife and has reduced overall productivity of the Mississippi River.

- 2) Lower pool water levels during the commercial navigation season may affect commercial users of the navigation system, and/or increase the amount of dredging at some locations to ensure unimpeded commercial navigation.
- 3) Recreational boaters and other river users are accustomed to river access and use under stabilized water level conditions. [Added at Wkshp I: Replace with “Recreational boaters are concerned about adverse effects of low water levels.”)
- 4) Some citizens and biologists are concerned about possible adverse effects of periodic water drawdowns on fish. [Deleted by one subgroup of W.]
- 5) [Added at Wkshp W] Long-term commitment to realize habitat benefits.
- 6) [Added at Wkshp W] Artificial in nature – should be more linked to natural cycles, especially droughts.
- 7) [Added at Wkshp W] We need to educate the recreational boaters to the larger picture, benefits of drawdowns.
- 8) [Added at Wkshp W] Improve opportunities to express opinions.
- 9) [Added at Wkshp W] Ensure that businesses are aware and have ample time to prepare and adapt to water level management.
- 10) [Added at Wkshp W] Use water level management to maintain adequate flows during drought periods to prevent large algae blooms, etc.
- 11) [Added at Wkshp S] Drawdown combined with normal sedimentation creates more vegetation, which inhibits boat traffic in shallower pools, especially in Pool 13.
- 12) [Added at Wkshp S] Accountability and cooperation between agencies (State DNR, COE, other partners).

- 13) [Added at Wkshp I] Impacts to power plants and other utilities affected by drawdowns
- 14) [Added at Wkshp I] Holistic management of the river; dynamic infrastructure to accommodate change.
- 15) [Added at Wkshp I] Nothing is static in recreational demands, utilities; habitats are always evolving.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Drawdowns successful management tool, should be continued and expanded and continuously evaluated.
- 2) W--How long do effects persist?
- 3) W--Frequency of the drawdowns.
- 4) W--Need for public education-what to expect, what is the plan.
- 5) W--Safety issues.
- 6) W--Benefit-common practice in wildlife management.
Prairie pot holes.
- 7) Evidence there-no need for further study.
- 8) W--Long term benefits vs. short term sacrifices.
- 9) W--Emphasis on health of Refuge-drawdown a tool to accomplish this.
- 10) W--Balancing competing needs of the river.
- 11) W--Experiment with multiple year drawdowns.
- 12) W--Drawdowns can be a wide range of projects-(6” to several feet).
- 13) W--Public education on need for water level management.
- 14) W--Concern that drawdowns don’t adversely impact native species and increase invasives.
- 15) W--Can we find funding for recreational dredging?
- 16) W--Water level management is accepted as a viable tool for environmental pool plans.
- 17) W--Support the current WLM efforts, recognizing that these efforts should lead to systemic, natural water level fluctuations that hopefully can be

implemented in the next 15 year planning process.

- 18) O--We need a good understanding of what influences water level on the river, (i.e. lock and dam, precip., weather, power generation, urbanization).
- 19) O--Try to more closely replicate a free flowing river to enhance plant & wildlife that utilize this habitat. Shorebirds may need exposed banks or mud flats that changing water levels provide.
- 20) O--Positive impact on the environment, should override boater or other uses on the river. Boater objections should not override water level management.
- 21) O--Help to control sediment and flush out the river.
- 22) O--Is it just a temporary solution?
- 23) O--Uncovering buried structures and filling in of boat channels.
- 24) I--Habitat substitution through more active management intervention may be needed to offset habitat losses that cannot be achieved through drawdowns.
- 25) I--Changes in “natural cycles” that were previously existing should be simulated; management should take cyclic disturbance regimes of the river into consideration.
- 26) I--Need for dredging access for power boat owners; they are legitimate river users too. Beneficial use sites to serve recreational or habitat needs developed with dredged materials. Placement alternatives to avoid the most sensitive areas, not just sites themselves.
- 27) I-- “Tree trust” involvement in mast tree planting; possible involvement of industry in management activities (funding, etc.).
- 28) W--Position Statement: The use of drawdowns as a means of improving habitat is supported by the entire group (*i.e., one group*). It is a proven method as evidenced by Pool 8 drawdowns, as it emulates what took place naturally prior to the lock and dams. The cycle of drought and wet on prairie potholes is also an example. Need to keep long term benefits

versus short term losses (i.e., ducks nests) in mind. Need to keep better informed of benefits, process, safety issues, etc.

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--Pursue/accelerate active water level management on the river (pool wide drawdowns) to improve species diversity (distribution and abundance).
- 2) W--Evaluate the long term effects of drawdowns. Incorporate long term research and monitoring to assess long term impacts of drawdown.
- 3) W--Determine range of possibilities for every pool at various levels of drawdown, mud flat exposure, impact on boating.
- 4) W--Public input and education should remain a priority for drawdowns.
- 5) W--Print drawdown information in regulations and at landings.
- 6) W--Continue working with the boating/navigation industry to limit problems. Emulate the existing process.
- 7) W--Public education on the need for water level management.
- 8) W--Ensure that water drawdowns don't adversely impact native species and increase invasive species.
- 9) W--Establish a public/private trust fund to allow private dollars to assist in funding critical recreational dredging as well as other environmental projects.
- 10) W--Water level management is accepted as a viable tool for environmental pool plans.
- 11) W--Support the current WLM efforts, recognizing that these efforts should lead to systemic, natural water level fluctuations that hopefully can be implemented in the next 15 year planning process.
- 12) O--Need better coordination between agendas of all agencies.
- 13) O--Collaboratively determine the capabilities of agencies to manage water levels.

- 14) O--Develop an educational and marketing strategy with the public for water level management.
- 15) O--In spring, drawdowns might raise water levels to replicate natural high water events. Maybe lower water levels in the fall.
- 16) O--Duplicate natural cycle of water level changes. Don't hold water levels the same all year.
- 17) O--Convince the Corps of the benefits of altering water levels. Put wildlife on the same level as barges. Should be able to maintain navigation and enhance habitat.
- 18) O--May need to influence Congress to change the operation restrictions on water level controls used at each lock & dam.
- 19) O--Use water level management as an educational tool to keep the public informed and get support for management goals and changing regulations.
- 20) O--Continue to implement drawdowns to be as close to hydrologic cycle or experiment to determine the best use of drawdowns.
- 21) O--Better awareness and use of dredge material.
- 22) O--Deepen the main channel.
- 23) O--Continue research to validate the benefits of the drawdown.
- 24) O--Continue building and minimize island loss.
- 25) O--Educate river users about river habitat.
- 26) P-- Work with current interagency groups to evaluate past drawdowns and recommend new ones, including timing.
- 27) P--Continue public involvement and education with drawdowns.
- 28) S--Encourage farm service agencies to work with landowners on erosion prevention measures.
- 29) S--Limiting depth and length of barges.
- 30) S--Drawdown didn't work for three years. Work with Corps to raise level from 1 to 2 feet in exchange with shoreline improvements; build dikes around Potter's with spillways and pumps. Drain and re-vegetate Potter's. "Horsetrade with the bastards."
- 31) S--Use Partners for Wildlife program to improve lowlands along river.
- 32) S--Since pool drawdowns haven't been working, dike smaller areas (e.g., Potter's) so that smaller areas can be drawn down to improve vegetation. Part of horsetrade.
- 33) S--More studies need to be conducted by an impartial group and published concerning the advantages and disadvantages of drawdowns.
- 34) S--Enforcement of more vigorous existing regulations.
- 35) S--Cooperating with agencies and conservation organizations.
- 36) S--Drawdowns seem to be severe—should be more scheduled, moderate and strategic.
- 37) S--Boaters are just going to have to adapt to fluctuating water level.
- 38) S--Time to establish drawdown not to hamper with spawning periods.
- 39) S--Local users. Voicing concern to politicians, FWS, COE, etc.
- 40) S--Become more pro-active about impact from adjacent lands, rather than reactive.
- 41) S--More money needs to be spent on land conservation programs.
- 42) S--Allocate money to local conservation agencies able to influence impacts in the watershed.
- 43) S--Educate the public—through news media, letters to the editor, etc.—about the benefits and disadvantages of periodic drawdowns.
- 44) S--Use results from Pool 8 drawdown to illustrate potential benefits of drawdowns.
- 45) S--Cautiously proceed with implementation of a drawdown program.
- 46) I--Finish surveying all pools to determine water depths for draw-down modeling.
- 47) I--Draw down on a rotational basis to maximum extent possible.
- 48) I--Make periodic draw-downs the norm rather than the exception.

- 49) I--Mandate extension needed to cover COE full costs of maintenance and access dredging.
- 50) I--Educate broader public on value of draw-downs.
- 51) I--Locate dredged material placement sites to avoid impacting sensitive areas. This applies mainly to downriver districts, which did not fully implement the goals identified through GREAT (Great River Environmental Action Team), etc.
- 52) I--Raise water levels as well as lower them as needed.
- 53) I--Keep navigation interests involved in pool planning and ecosystem management.
- 54) I--Consider impacts of water level changes on mussel populations.
- 55) I--Any new utility developments need to consider non-static water levels. Refuge coordination.
- 56) I--Implement pool plans.
- 57) I--Implement more options in Problem Appraisal Report for Water Level Management.
- 58) I--Create a coordinated program for water level management throughout the Refuge on an appropriate time cycle (i.e., drawdowns on a staggered 5 year rotation).
- 59) I--Establish flexible options to allow managers to work with whatever hydrology occurs in a particular year (i.e., drought years, flood years); work with COE to alter control plans to allow more

flexibility; don't lock in dates; promote flexibility with public.

15. The Issue: Water Level Management *[Added at Wkshp P]*

Main Concerns

- 1) Water level management by the Corps of Engineers (or lack thereof) has created erosion of sandbars and islands leading to the loss of recreational areas, loss of wildlife habitat, and sedimentation of backwaters.
- 2) Water levels affect access to Refuge, be it at boat ramps or backwaters.
- 3) Better water level management and proper flow control would improve backwater conditions for plants, fish habitat, and access for the public.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Establish an interagency task force to define and evaluate water level management to evaluate impacts from storm events and hydropower generation on main stem pools.
- 2) Better water level management and proper flow control would improve backwater conditions for plants, fish habitat, and access for the public.
- 3) Continue public involvement and education with water level management.

Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge

RECREATION – Part 2 of 3

Statements are preceded by one of 5 letters listed below that correspond to the workshop city in which the statement was made.

O = Onalaska, P = Prairie du Chien,
S = Savanna, W = Winona and I = Interagency Team (UW-La Crosse)

1. The Issue: Camping and Beach Use *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

Main Concerns *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

- 1) Most uses associated with beaches and "bathtubs" are not wildlife-dependent recreation uses, and generally not allowed on most National Wildlife Refuges.

- 2) Many beach users would like to see the number of beaches increase. However, expansion of beaches on the Refuge would be at the expense of wildlife habitat.
- 3) Maintenance of “bathtubs” and beaches, litter control, signing, possible sanitation provisions, and law enforcement requires Refuge staff and funding.
- 4) Camping, whether on the main channel or in backwaters, can cause wildlife disturbances.
- 5) *[Added by Group P]* Sand bars are not used in a manner that minimizes the impact on fish and wildlife.
- 6) *[Added by Group I]* Closing bathtubs may disperse use to other areas that are beneficial to wildlife: i.e., it may be best to concentrate public use at bathtubs.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Main concern is dangerous debris on camping areas (glass, nails, etc.). Restrict campers from using glass other dangerous items.
- 2) W--We have enough beaches. No need to develop more camping areas. Camping should not be promoted. Let river dictate.
- 3) W--Boating increasing at a terrific rate. Should not increase camping opportunities. Not compatible with other Refuge activities.
- 4) W--People not comfortable fishing on weekends due to increased boating traffic.
- 5) W--No problem with open bathtubs.
- 6) W--Conflicts at the bathtubs/ beaches (party groups vs. family groups).
- 7) W--Provides opportunities for some people to experience a NWR. These experiences will mold or shape future ideas about the Refuge system. Without the camping areas these folks may not get out on the Refuge.
- 8) W--Educate the public on respect of the Refuge and other user groups.
- 9) W--Designated low or other impact areas.
- 10) W--There are positive and negative aspects of “Bathtub” usage and the public needs to be educated about the purposes and dangers of bathtubs.
- 11) W--Beach management is a great source of public frustration.
- 12) W--Semantics of beaches vs. sandbars.
- 13) W--Public needs education on use and conduct on sandbar and evolution and changes affecting sandbar/beaches.
- 14) W--Follow through management of critical habitats is lacking.
- 15) W--These uses generally exist along main channel and reduce use of backwater habitats.
- 16) W--Enforcement may or may not be adequate enough to help regulation use.
- 17) O--What is “camping”? Example: does it include people sleeping in their boats to keep a hunting spot for the next day even if there are no tents etc.?
- 18) O--Do bathtubs lessen impact in other areas?
- 19) O--Increase funding for education regarding use.
- 20) O--People monopolize beaches using the 14-day limit. It is too long and people leave them unattended for days.
- 21) O--Camping and beach use (sandbars) is compatible with the UMRFWR. However the following concerns need to be addressed (as noted above).
- 22) O--Eliminating litter.
- 23) O--Problem with human waste.
- 24) O--Over-use of beaches.
- 25) O--More enforcement needed.
- 26) I--Human use on the Refuge is most likely to increase in the future – would it be better to disperse or “confine” the use?
- 27) I--Concern is whether USFWS has jurisdiction to close beaches or tubs due to navigable waters issues; can boaters anchor offshore to access lands; the issue is both land and water.
- 28) I--Conflicts with different types of boating (motors vs. non-motors) are becoming prevalent.

[Added by Group W] Position Statement:
Camping and boating are increasing at a terrific rate. Many conflicts have arisen. Examples would be: large boats versus small fishing boats,

and single families versus large parties. There is a need for controls to be implemented to preserve the beaches for everyone (i.e., removal of glass on the Refuge). Camping is supported, however this group believes the Refuge has enough camping areas. We do not want to see more camping areas created. Let the river determine where the sand forms the beaches. Education and enforcement is the key to keeping the camping and beaches clean and accessible to the public.

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--Education on appropriate uses of camping areas and enforcement.
- 2) W--Regulate camping through designation of camping areas and or consider a permit system and/or modify regulations (amount of time site can be occupied).
- 3) W--Do not increase the number of beach sites (see #2 under Main Concerns and Additional Discussion Notes).
- 4) W--Maintain the beaches already established.
- 5) W--The term "beach" implies improvements and maintenance and to clarify this we suggest the use of the term "sandbar."
- 6) W--Selective sandbar enhancement in cooperation with other agencies to focus high impact recreational use away from sensitive habitat.
- 7) W--Maintain current level of beach use without expansion with enforcement.
- 8) O--Higher visibility of law enforcement.
- 9) O--Increase funding for educational and enforcement.
- 10) O--Promote the Leave No Trace Program.
- 11) O--Undertake a structured public discussion between users and agencies to continue to develop beach management plans that address concerns listed in the fact sheet (eg., alcohol, litter, noise etc.).
- 12) O--Undertake an integrated sociological and ecological applied research as it relates to camping and beach use in terms of impact analysis.
- 13) O--Refuge managers are directed to develop a refuge watch/auxiliary volunteer program to enhance refuge and user relationships.
- 14) O--Develop a marketing plan for the constructive utilization of the river by users and ways to better reach the public, esp. boaters.
- 15) O--Learn from other user programs (ATV, snowmobile, horse trails).
- 16) O--Change terminology from "beach" to "sandbar."
- 17) O--Improve enforcement, education.
- 18) O--Explore ways to regulate and oversee camping.
- 19) Only within sight of the main channel.
 - Designate campsites?
 - Minimize impacts of human waste.
 - Protect the backwaters.
- 20) O--Maintain and restore sandbars on the River (small size).
- 21) O--User fee (stickers) for management and enforcement.
- 22) O--Educate that recreational uses are on a National Wildlife Refuge.
- 23) O--ADOPT-a-Beach.
- 24) O--Public enforcement to reduce littering.
- 25) P--Sand bars should be used and maintained for the benefit of recreational activity while minimizing the impact on fish and wildlife.
- 26) P--Coordinate with user groups to develop new funding sources for river recreation areas and law enforcement.
- 27) P--Encourage development of working relationships between user groups and law enforcement.
- 28) P--Coordinate law enforcement functions on the river.
- 29) P--Develop understandings and agreements with state and local governments as well as non-governmental organizations (boaters, campers, etc.) regarding camping and beach use on the Refuge.
- 30) P--Educate user groups regarding importance and scope of regional refuge

areas.

- 31) S--Better job of informing users of the nature of the Refuge.
- 32) S--Better mechanism for ensuring awareness of rules and regulations (camping).
- 33) S--Use enhances appreciation of the natural beauty of the river, which may be consistent with other uses of the river.
- 34) S--Studies should be done to insure appropriate use of properties, whether for wildlife habitat or for public use.
- 35) S--Get the public involved more in cleanup through volunteer program.
- 36) S--More education of the public on the Refuge mission.
- 37) I--Dispersing use and confining use – both should be viewed from the perspective of “quality experience.”
- 29) I--Develop and implement a water surface use plan for the river; comprehensive recreation plan.
- 30) I--Develop non-motorized use areas; could be consistent with closed areas? Closed areas may not be desirable for canoes or kayaks.
- 31) I--Restrict jet skis, camping and non-wildlife oriented (disturbance generating) recreation to main channel; define main channel; establish travel lanes to access points.
- 32) I--Restrict access of large motor craft to main channel.
- 33) I--Create established camping areas and restrict number of campers; restrict camping to designated areas.
- 34) I--Create closed turtle nesting beaches; consider turtle habitat needs.
- 35) I--Require personal toilets for all campers (already required in the back country of many National Parks).

2. Competitive Sport Fishing

[Added by Group O]

Main Concerns

- 1) Use of the river.
- 2) Boat traffic.
- 3) Tournaments.

- 4) Dominates the river on certain days.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Eliminate or limit prize money on fishing tournaments.
- 2) Charge a significant fee for organized tournaments on the Refuge.
- 3) Limit the number of tournaments that can be held each month/year.
- 4) Cooperate with WI DNR to regulate fishing tournaments.

3. The Issue: Minimizing Visitor Conflicts *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

Main Concerns *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

- 5) The public may not accept time and space restraints to ensure high quality and safe recreational opportunities.
- 6) Conflicts between user groups are increasing.
- 7) Some groups fear those traditional consumptive uses of the Refuge, such as hunting, trapping and fishing may be curtailed.
- 8) There is a lack of staffing and funding on the Refuge to meet the demands for interpretive and educational programs and facilities.
- 9) *[Added by Group P]* No mechanism for conflict resolution between FWS and non-governmental groups and the public in general.
- 10) *[Added by Group P]* NGOs must take upon themselves greater ownership over the well-being of the Refuge.
- 11) *[Added by Group P]* A lack of awareness by the public of the existence of the Refuge.
- 12) *[Added by Group S]* Encroachment on personal property due to inadequate public access.
- 13) *[Added by Group S]* Need for education of river etiquette.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Perception by public that trapping is recreational rather than a viable

management tool.

- 2) W--Need more education of the public about the importance of "Leave No Trace"
- 3) W--Approximately 1/3 of public uses fall out of the "Big Six."
- 4) W--[*This group combined Use of Dogs and Other Domestic Animals with this issue.*] Current regulation governing the use of dogs on the Refuge is too restrictive.
- 5) W--Public is unaware about the existence of the Upper Miss Refuge, its purpose and regulations.
- 6) O--Airboats and PWC have access to areas others don't.
- 7) O--Need more boat landings (public access).
- 8) O--Impacts of dogs on Refuge.
- 9) O--Inconsiderate behavior.
- 10) O--Lack of control, authority, or regulations over fishing tournaments; over-fishing.
- 11) O--Adverse impacts and intrusion of people on habitat and wildlife, especially in closed areas.
- 12) O--Lack of observation areas.
- 13) O--Growing number of people using the Refuge with conflicting uses.
- 14) O--Airboats add to noise pollution and other shallow watercrafts impact wildlife (speed, access to backwater habitat).
- 15) O--People confuse the wording – what is a refuge? Is the Refuge a place to hunt and boat? Or is it a wildlife area? Terms - Closed Area/Refuge are confusing.
- 16) O--How do people find out where the Refuge is?
- 17) I--Who decides that a new trail will go in? If a trail is put into a designated hunting area conflicts are inevitable.
- 18) I--Is hearing a gunshot when hiking really something we should react to? Just because one group is offended by gunshot sound does that mean we have to identify an area as a no hunting area where it has traditionally been a hunting area?

- 19) I--Peoples' values are what we are dealing with rather than biological.

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--No pets will be allowed to disturb or endanger the refuge wildlife resource or people while on the Refuge. All dogs and other domestic pets while on the Refuge must be under the control of their owners at all times. No pets will be allowed to roam. All pets must be physically restrained when on posted designated areas such as hiking trails and sensitive areas, and when in close proximity of other people on recreational sandbars except when engaged in authorized hunting activity.
- 2) W--Increase funds for public education and law enforcement to minimize and adjudicate user conflicts.
- 3) W--Selected implementation of voluntary use avoidance to minimize user conflict (i.e. jet skis).
- 4) W--Fund the Upper Miss Refuge in recognition that 1/3 of the users fall outside the "Big Six."
- 5) W--Research and subsequent education to show that trapping is a viable tool for managing furbearer populations.
- 6) O-- Provide more outreach and education opportunities on the Refuge. Look for more volunteers to offer or assist with programs – especially on weekends.
- 7) O--Provide more outreach and education opportunities on the Refuge. Look for more volunteers to offer or assist with programs – especially on weekends.
- 8) O--Have staff & naturalists provide programs on weekends.
- 9) O--Have nature centers –maybe mobile displays and/or a centralized nature center.
- 10) O--Need to educate the public on the Refuge, its mission and purpose.
- 11) O--Need to educate the public on how the river works.
- 12) O--Need to educate the public on the

- components of the Refuge – fish, wildlife, habitat, plants, wetland communities, historical values.
- 13) O--Educate the public on the social and monetary value of the Refuge to the local economy and communities.
 - 14) O--Need to find a way to get people involved. There is a lot of information out there (kiosks, signs etc), but many people don't stop to read them.
 - 15) O--Having an office in a conspicuous location would be a big plus. Have the office near the river or at USGS on French island.
 - 16) O--Create centrally located nature centers.
 - 17) O--Volunteers/speakers bureau to talk to local groups.
 - 18) O--Take part in annual summer events – River fest, fishing days, sunfish days etc.
 - 19) O--Have a mobile display that can travel from city to city.
 - 20) O--Update web site on a regular/frequent basis. Put leaflets, upcoming meetings on web site.
 - 21) O--Use the mascot more.
 - 22) O--Jet skis/PWC – should be prohibited from back waters. Limit to main channel use only. Will reduce degradation of habitat. Fishing boats or other boats can also cause problems. Create no wake zones or speed limits in back waters.
 - 23) O--Make non-motorized areas in back waters. This will be an enforcement issue for a few years, but will be worth the effort (electric trolling motors are ok).
 - 24) O--Set up a poetry trail of some other type of quiet trail where people can commune with nature in a quiet setting and learn about the environment.
 - 25) O--Get public and local government agency input on constructing access facilities (easements, fish piers, boat landings, walk-in access).
 - 26) O--Develop a plan of action based on needs.
 - 27) O--Airboats and PWC negatively impact the Refuge. Restrict use:
 - Voluntary cooperation.
 - Enforcement of 80 decibel limit demanded of other craft.
 - 28) Possible restriction to main channel, but may have to make exception during trapping season.
 - 29) O--Provide more observation opportunities, facilities, and staff.
 - 30) O--Increase education and enforcement of current rules concerning consideration of others. Increase staff presence.
 - 31) O--Restrict water skiing to 200 feet from shoreline (define Lake Onalaska as a lake).
 - 32) O--Boat safety classes for all boat operators, establish NO Wake Areas, Boating Courtesy.
 - 33) O--Electronic law enforcement (Laser and Bar Code).
 - 34) O--Volunteer hunting location registration in parking lots.
 - 35) O--Investigate methods for controlling the impacts of shallow watercraft and maintaining habitat (submerged aquatics).
 - 36) O--Create buffers by water depths (i.e., recommended use in area).
 - 37) O--Work with manufacturers to minimize noise.
 - 38) O--Designate “wild areas” where motors are restricted.
 - 39) O--Noise restriction zones.
 - 40) O--Hunting guides tend to monopolize the best hunting areas.
 - 41) O--Legalize open water hunting to reduce need to get to blinds so early and increase the area available to hunting. Will spread out hunters.
 - 42) O--Robo ducks – some favor eliminating the use of mechanical decoys on the Refuge.
 - 43) P--Coordinate law enforcement functions on the river.
 - 44) P--Educate user groups regarding importance and scope of regional refuge areas (redo – increase awareness change

- behavior, understand mission, instill appreciation of Refuge).
- 45) P--Encourage boating community to organize and work with FWS on user problems.
 - 46) P--Work with boating groups, local government, state agencies to develop boating guidelines and regulations.
 - 47) S--Educate, raise awareness of proper etiquette when using the Refuge. Promote cooperation between all public users.
 - 48) S--More public meetings before decisions are made.
 - 49) S--Make sure website is updated and available for public education and information.
 - 50) S--Need for education of river etiquette.
 - 51) S--Public education of Refuge mission.
 - 52) S--200 yard distance for fishermen from hunters.
 - 53) S--Rules of the road for vessel operation on Refuge.
 - 54) S--Speed limits.
 - 55) S--Stricter enforcement of noise pollution.
 - 56) S--No wake zones.
 - 57) S--Restrict PWC from specific areas—backwaters.
 - 58) S--Good signage of restricted areas.
 - 59) S--Anti-pollution rules.
 - 60) S--Close early teal and goose season.
 - 61) S--A 200 yards buffer zone between bike trail and hunters.
 - 62) S--Control timing of season and activities (e.g., close hunting at noon or close early teal season).
 - 63) S--Close hunting area to fishing during the hunting season.
 - 64) S--Education/enforcement rules.
 - 65) S--Consistency between four states and refuge rules and regulations.
 - 66) S--Increase memberships in refuge-friendly groups.
 - 67) I--A lot of conflicts among user groups may need additional research and monitoring to determine whether it is a “perception” of conflict or a reality of

- conflict (i.e., Hearing a gunshot in the distance versus being in an area where hunting occurs. Can the two co-exist? Can a bow hunter be along the trail?).
- 68) I--Hunting/fishing/trapping season overlap vs. separate seasons. Enact new laws to minimize conflicts.
 - 69) I--Earlier hunting seasons have brought on new conflicts. For example the early goose season could potential put hunters and campers out in the same areas during the Labor Day weekend in September. Because camping is not allowed in the closed areas during hunting seasons – recreational camping is curtailed as well.
 - 70) I--See closed area discussion – may increase conflicts, or should include caveats to continue to allow some uses.
 - 71) I--Develop a recreational management plan to include recommendations for time zone management to address the conflicts of personal watercraft and canoes.
 - 72) I--Develop recreational use plan, which includes evaluation of all methods to reduce/eliminate user conflicts (i.e., slow no wake zones, non motorized areas, camping permit system etc.).

Other Notes and Comments

- 1) S--Close the early teal and goose season at noon.
- 2) S--Close areas of the bike trail during hunting season (all hunting dove, rabbit).
- 3) S--Buffer zone between bike trail and the hunters.
- 4) S--Education and courtesy.
- 5) S--No fishing vs. no hunting zones.
- 6) S--Common rules for both sides of the river.
- 7) S--Communication between Feds, State, Army Corps of Engineers.
- 8) S--Enforcement of rules.
- 9) S--Open the pocket book.
- 10) S--Tourism brings in a lot of money--both fishing and hunting--can't stop one or the other.

- 11) S--Ninety percent of conversation is duck hunting related.
- 12) S--Sky busting from out of native area.
- 13) S--Change quota zone.
- 14) S--Change quota.

4. The Issue: Permanent Hunting Blinds

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

- 1) The use of permanent blinds at the Savanna District is inconsistent with hunting regulations on the rest of the Refuge and inconsistent with State regulations.
- 2) The placement of wooden structures within the river eventually results in those materials being deposited in the river due to deterioration, floods, and ice or wind/wave action. These materials may become safety hazards for boaters.
- 3) Most permanent blind sites are claimed year after year by the same group of individuals. This regulation promotes private exclusive use, which is inconsistent with Refuge objectives to allow equal opportunity for public recreation.
- 4) Permanent blinds limit hunting opportunities due to: a) the 200 yard spacing requirement, even for boat blinds—regardless if the blind is empty; b) no shoreline jump-shooting allowed; c) the best hunting sites are taken year after year.
- 5) Due to an increase in new hunters to the Savanna District, confrontations and incidents related to permanent blinds have increased. Incidents include verbal threats, physical confrontations, assaults, blind burnings, and guns being pointed in a threatening manner. Two blind burnings occurred in 2002.
- 6) *[Concerns 1 and 3 eliminated by Group S]*
- 7) *[Concern 2 Modified by Group S]*
Permanent blinds provide safer opportunities due to a) the 200 yard spacing requirement, even for boat

- blinds—regardless if the blind is empty;
- b) no shoreline jump-shooting allowed.
- 8) *[Added by Group S]* Blinds are accessible to all when empty.
- 9) *[Added by Group S]* Alternative rules need to be written if permanent blinds are to be eliminated.
- 10) *[Added by Group S]* Issues are stacked against permanent blinds.
- 11) *[Added by Group S]* There is potential that permanent blinds would be eliminated from the Refuge.
- 12) *[Added by Group S]* Lack of FWS ability to set proper rules for permanent blinds, which creates associated problems (e.g., tag day).
- 13) *[Added by Group S]* The 5 identified concerns are not valid.
- 14) *[Added by Group S]* Areas on river should be managed differently to reflect differences in area populations.
- 15) *[Added by Group S]* Removal of permanent blinds will increase conflicts between user groups.

Potential Solutions

- 1) P--Eliminate permanent blinds from the Refuge.
- 2) S--Implement system of permanent sites—instead of permanent blinds—allocated annually by user-funded lottery in designated priority areas. In all other areas, allow open hunting with 200 yard spacing requirement.
- 3) S--Permanent blinds should stay in districts where they are preferred.
- 4) S--FWS should publicize tag day dates and blind regs in local media.
- 5) S--Permanent blinds stop conflicts.
- 6) S--Permanent blinds provide habitat.
- 7) S--Have a “duck hunter’s cleanup day” where duck hunting volunteers remove debris/repair.
- 8) S--Permanent blinds allow others to hunt in a quality area if not already in use, so other hunters benefit.
- 9) S--Leave rules the same, except remove blinds at end of season.

- 10) S--Leave permanent blind system as it is.
- 11) S--Keep permanent blinds as is.
- 12) S--Provide areas for boat blinds.
- 13) S--Keep specific access for permanent areas.
- 14) S--Leave things as they are according to local tradition.
- 15) S--Eliminate permanent blinds entirely.
- 16) S--Ensure 200 yard spacing restriction with GPS system for locations.
- 17) S--Must have rules/regulations the same. (Have the same on both sides of the river.)
- 18) S--Eliminate tag day.
- 19) S--Impose drawing for year.
- 20) S--Impose daily drawing.
- 21) S--Keep the 200 yd. distance from blinds. (More quality.)
- 22) S--Comment: open access and equal access (outside of Potter's Marsh).
- 23) S--Eliminate permanent blinds.
- 24) S--Open it up.
- 25) S--Boat blinds or floating blinds.
- 26) S--Stake permanent spots with GPS and have a daily drawing for those spots.
- 27) S--Use a daily drawing for safety.
- 28) S--Don't change anything.
- 29) S--Enforce common courtesy.
- 30) S--One group recommended removing Main Concerns numbered 2 and 4 above from the list.
- 31) I--Eliminate permanent hunting blinds, over a period of time.
- 32) I--Waterfowl hunting only occurs from blinds.
- 33) I--Examine data to determine what is needed from a management perspective, public acceptance, enforcement issue, etc. for any alternative evaluation and implementation.
- 34) I--Only allow permanent blinds and boat blinds.
- 35) I--Do not allow proprietary rights to public lands.
- 36) I--If permanent blinds are allowed to be used, enforce the removal of the permanent blind after season.

- 37) I--Scattered tagging of sites – mark on map, enter GIS, lottery overlapping area.
- 38) I--Permanent blinds can space hunters out over an area increasing the quality of hunt.
- 39) I--Potters Marsh is socially driven (no biological reason to continue)
- 40) I--Do permanent blinds need permit as a permanent structure?

Other Notes and Comments

- 1) S--Two blind burnings occurred in 2002.
- 2) S--The “good old boys” can keep their blinds forever.
- 3) S-- “Its tradition. It's public land, and yet that guy has had a blind there for forty years. Explain that to me.”
- 4) S--Maintain permanent blinds in Pool 13.
- 5) S-- “Against” permanent blinds and “for” wise use of refuge land.
- 6) S-- “For”: allows for safety and quality of hunting.
- 7) S--Maintain permanent blinds while allowing states to put on restrictions.
- 8) S--Aesthetics—the time to change is now.
- 9) S--Opportunity to get same blind each year.
- 10) S--Iowa and Illinois have separate rules and regs that are hard to follow for those who buy licenses for each side.
- 11) S--Kill more geese.
- 12) S--Wise Lake needs permanent blinds because of required walkways (needs clarification).
- 13) S--Have tag day in September.
- 14) S--Out of state vs. natives.
- 15) S--Out of state shoot because they brought the shells.
- 16) S--Rule should not include having to hunt next to vegetation as in Wisconsin.
- 17) S--Tag times are too competitive.
- 18) S--Night before camping.
- 19) S--Be able to use camo netting.
- 20) S--Camo netting is polluting.
- 21) S--Fairness.
- 22) S--Attract birds by planting food.

- 23) S--There has been an increase in birds, but not ducks.
- 24) S--Close the hunting season at noon because ducks would settle.
- 25) S--Iowa vs. Illinois consistency regs.
- 26) S--Blind management.
- 27) S--Territorial conflicts of blind areas for life.
- 28) S--Tag day process.
- 29) S--Traditional tag day not right.
- 30) S--Native vs. out of town competition for use.
- 31) S--Trash enforcement.
- 32) S--Equal access to all.

5. The Issue: Potter's Marsh Blind Management Zone

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns [Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

- 1) Managing the hunt requires considerable staff time to answer inquiries, accept applications, collect and process fees, conduct two drawings, inspect blinds for compliance and area posting. See attached list of all duties required by staff.
- 2) This hunt annually requires more than 300 hours of staff time to administer; time which is taken away from resource management programs. No other single program on the District requires this amount of time to administer and results in no benefit to the resource.
- 3) The fees collected do not cover the total expenses incurred for administering and managing the hunt due to the amount of staff time required. Additionally, under a new policy in 2003, only 80% of fees will be returned to the Refuge, as compared with 100% returned in previous years.
- 4) The random drawing process has been manipulated to the point that it is no longer an equal opportunity program. Some hunting parties get the same blind year after year.
- 5) Hunting opportunity for the general public is limited due to only 49 blinds

available on 1,830 acres. The area can accommodate a maximum of 196 hunters on any given day due to the blind system that is below public demand. *[Modified by Group S to Read: Limited on opening day; however, hunting opportunity for the general public is outstanding due to 49 blinds available on 1,830 acres. There are usually plenty of blinds available for the general public to hunt after opening weekends, especially weekdays.]*

- 6) *[Added by Group S]* Fishing during waterfowl hunting season.
- 7) *[Added by Group S]* Loss of permanent blinds.
- 8) *[Added by Group S]* Thomson Prairie bike path.
- 9) *[Added by Group S]* Equality needed for all hunters.
- 10) *[Added by Group S]* 5 concerns listed are all invalid.
- 11) *[Added by Group S]* FWS trying to "shove Potter's off" instead of managing it.
- 12) *[Added by Group S]* Contradictions in FWS data (e.g., % of blinds used, number of hunters) do not support need to eliminate. Potter's is underutilized; therefore, not a problem since other than drawing winners can use.
- 13) *[Added by Group S]* Savanna office perceived as not supporting "traditional IL river duck hunting."
- 14) *[Added by Group S]* This people vs. bureaucracy issue.
- 15) *[Added by Group S]* If FWS is running drawing, then any manipulation is their fault.

Potential Solutions

- 1) S--Increase fees to cover costs.
- 2) S-- "Hell of a job for a quality hunt."
- 3) S--Get volunteers (DU, WUSA) to help with drawing.
- 4) S--Statistics prove the quality of Potter's and need to keep it.
- 5) S--Have a 2 year draw to cut costs.

- 6) S--If not broke, don't fix it.
- 7) S--Part of job of FWS—managing hunt.
- 8) S--Keep the quality up.
- 9) S--Reduce money in getting rid of the signs.
- 10) S--Sign markers.
- 11) S--Signs: after you build the blind and it is inspected and carded, return the sign in the field to the Refuge office.
- 12) S--To help cut costs, volunteers could help with fieldwork.
- 13) S--Extend blind building to September 15; the August heat is too heavy.
- 14) S--Reduce staff hours to administer hunt.
- 15) S--Drawing process concerns:
 - 1) --Hold a one-day drawing.
 - 2) --Do the registration by mail.
 - 3) --Hold different type drawing.
 - 4) --Must have all licenses and stamps; write down 4 names on application; every name can only appear on two applications; give the blinds out for two years at Potter's Marsh. This would apply to Concerns 2 and 4, reducing costs and fairness issues.
- 16) S--Single draw, must be present to win.
- 17) S--One day drawing.
- 18) S--Eliminate permanent blind building to boat blinds.
- 19) S--Volunteers help as needed. Increase fee by 25% to cover costs.
- 20) S--Form volunteer committee to inspect blinds to free up FWS employees.
- 21) S--Increase user pay \$ for launch sites (Mickelson) for all users—100% back to management.
- 22) S--Names on blind card must be present at the time of drawing.
- 23) S--Daily blind drawing (better to manage) not all agree, should not charge any fees with daily draw.
- 24) S--Friends group to help with implementation of program.
- 25) S--Two year drawing instead of every year.
- 26) S--Leave it the same.
- 27) S--3 or 4 day draw.

- 28) S--Close to fishing/boating.
- 29) S--Close hunting after noon each day.
- 30) S--Keep the blinds.
- 31) S--Blinds getting too close to bike path.
- 32) S--Eliminate Issue 4 drawing process because the system is not manipulative.
- 33) S--Change drawing process: 1 day draw for season—must be present.
- 34) S--Impose a tag day like west lake.
- 35) S--Impose open hunting, like in green island.
- 36) S--Eliminate #5 because there are plenty of public opportunities.
- 37) S--Don't change drawing; just increase to cover cost.
- 38) S--Don't fix it if it is not broken.

Other Notes and Comments

- 1) S--Staff time and drawing process.
- 2) S--FWS staff time money.
- 3) S--Fairness.
- 4) S--Restrictive use.
- 5) S--Consistent.
- 6) S--Drawing process.
- 7) S--Eliminate drawing to be like rest of the Refuge.
- 8) S--Education.
- 5)

6. The Issue: Public Access

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

- 1) A segment of the public feels that there are not enough access points for bank and ice fishing.
- 2) To access the Refuge for ice fishing, the public often parks on roadsides, crosses over railroad tracks and sometimes crosses private property.
- 3) There is inadequate funding at all levels to establish, maintain and publicize public access. *[This Concern Deleted by Group W.]*
- 4) *[Added by Group W]* Over-development of some accesses.
- 5) *[Added by Group W]* Better planning – strategic access and safety concerns.
- 6) *[Added by Group W]* Make sure planned

access reflects priorities of the CCP (e.g., move use restrictions--possibly less access and more strategic placement).

- 7) *[Added by Group S]* Public access areas are poorly maintained and not updated.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) O--Need better coordination with other agencies and local government.
- 2) O--FWS should provide better boat access at key locations.
- 3) O--Railroad restricts locations of boat landings.
- 4) O--Fees for landings but that would bring along more problems (collection, coordination, etc.).
- 5) O--Public Access is a serious issue that includes boat access. Public access is the key to public use and public support is important for the Refuge.
- 6) I--Should access points be abandoned and moved to where the habitat is better?

Potential Solutions

- 1) W-- Ensure that planned access development and access maintenance reflects priorities of Big Six and listed purposes of Upper Miss. River Refuge.
- 2) O--Get public and local government and agency input on constructing access facilities (i.e., easements, fishing piers, boat launch and walk in access).
- 3) O--Develop a plan of action based on needs.
- 4) O--Create more access points and boat landings or expand existing ones.
- 5) P--Develop a public access management plan in cooperation with other agencies and local units of governments.
- 6) P--Provide special permits for commercial fishermen and disabled individuals in select areas for safety of operation.
- 7) S--Make Refuge more user-friendly with signs and maps and through public outreach.
- 8) S--Limited access to boat ramps.
- 9) S--Boat launching: there are enough now

so don't need to increase this number.

- 10) S--Ice fishing: walk in access must be increased.
- 11) S--Marked ATV paths needed.
- 12) S--Educate public that what they take in must be taken out with them.
- 13) S--Put game wardens to work writing tickets for leaving trash.
- 14) S--Parking lot on west side of road at Spring Lake (Sloane Marsh).
- 15) S--Negotiate access across railroad right-of-ways by foot.
- 16) S--Negotiate access across private landowner by foot.
- 17) S--Land acquisition for access.
- 18) S--Parking lot on west side of road at Spring Lake (Sloane Marsh).
- 19) S--More access from the Savanna Depot. Open the boat ramps.
- 20) S--Allow access for fishing within areas that have been dredged on private property.
- 21) S--Railroad right of ways—open areas for access to cross.
- 22) S--Walk in areas for accessibility.
- 23) I--Make sure accessible areas can provide a quality experience.
- 24) I--Improve habitat where access already exists. Some access points like Weaver Bottoms have lost their habitat value.
- 25) I--Develop public access management plan coordinate with Corps of Engineers, States, and County.
- 26) I--Improve access points.
- 27) I--To be able to improve facilities add user fees for ramps and camping.

7. The Issue: Use of Dogs and Other Domestic Animals

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

- 1) Free running dogs on a crowded sandbar, a hiking trail, or other sensitive locations may result in conflicts between visitors, unwanted disturbance, or injury from dog bites.
- 2) Free running dogs can chase, disturb, or even kill wildlife.

- 3) The public would like to be able to continue swimming their dogs at landings or from sandbars during the summer months and to allow non-hunting dogs to be off-leash on the Refuge from the beginning of hunting season through winter.
- 4) Free-ranging and urban house cats take a toll on wildlife, and trespassing cattle and horses trample vegetation and may disturb Refuge visitors.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) W--Current regulation governing the use of dogs on the Refuge is too restrictive.

Potential Solutions

- 1) W--No pets will be allowed to disturb or endanger the refuge wildlife resource or people while on the Refuge. All dogs and other domestic pets while on the Refuge must be under the control of their owners at all times. No pets will be allowed to roam. All pets must be physically restrained when on posted designated areas such as hiking trails and sensitive

areas, and when in close proximity of other people on recreational sandbars except when engaged in authorized hunting activity.

- 2) O--Dogs must be controlled and within sight of the owner on the Refuge. Refuge policy that will be enforced should be in writing.
- 3) O--No pets will be allowed to disturb or endanger the refuge wildlife resource or people while on the Refuge.
- 4) O--All dogs and other pets while on the Refuge must be under the control of their owners at all times. No dogs will be allowed to roam. All dogs and pets must be physically restrained when on posted designated areas such as hiking trails and sensitive areas, and when in close proximity of other people on recreational sandbars except when engaged in authorized hunting activity.
- 5) P-- Work with user groups to develop regulations that allow appropriate uses that do not endanger people or wildlife.

Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge

OTHER ISSUES – Part 3 of 3

Statements are preceded by one of 5 letters listed below that correspond to the workshop city in which the statement was made.

O = Onalaska, P = Prairie du Chien, S = Savanna, W = Winona, and I = Interagency Team (UW-La Crosse)

1. The Issue: Education - Wildlife Related *[Added at Wkshp I]*

Main Concerns

- 1) This is more than one of top 6 recreational uses. It is a cornerstone of public understanding and deserves its own priority: interpretation, formal education,

outreach. All are equally important to building the base of support needed for programs to succeed.

- 2) The average person lacks ecological awareness and ecological conscience to understand problems confronting refuge managers. Teachers, workshops, media, commercials: all aspects are insufficiently addressed, even though some qualified individuals and programs exist. Public involvement – still the same faces – 90 percent untouched.
- 3) Need at least one river educator or interpreter per pool; need regular events like Guttenberg example. Invasive species good example – people help transmit them.
- 4) Programming needed to address all the top

issues that have been identified.

- 5) Multiplier effect not working – why? Majority of people not getting message – many users come from distances not all audiences are local. Targeting wrong audiences.
- 6) Values and appreciation are instilled prior to 10 years of age – interactive web?
- 7) Those who are targeted by advertisers and getting WRONG VALUES instilled.
- 8) Basic needs of people must be met first: we eat, sleep and drink conservation; most
- 9) people are concerned primarily with their consumption habits and lifestyle – broader continuing education needs to be incorporated at all levels and all activities.
- 10) Expectation of “just do it” lifestyle – short attention span – ignorance.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Send staff into schools: more Outreach Coordinators for each district. Schools hungry for more of this. Better river curriculum needed. Better ways to teach the teachers. Penetrate new audiences with the people who work with them most effectively. Fountain City example: all teachers in seasonal workshops, recording experiences, sensitizing to the outdoors, transmitting it to their students. Staff should work with administrators and teachers.
- 2) Use SEEK program on website; EE workshops at Nature Centers near river; TV programs like “Into the Outdoors” (Gretchen Benjamin is on advisory staff) tie in refuge programming. Train the instructors in refuge resources and techniques and sites. Public service announcements. Less argument on management if common knowledge present.
- 3) Every staff member needs basic training requirement and a requirement to do outreach in a way that is not filler or babysitting for tired teachers. Canned videos, slides and other resource materials need to be readily available to staff to use

or loan out.

- 4) Programs that explain differences in habitat and how land uses cause problems or can help provide solutions when positive changes are made. Improve kiosk system.
- 5) RiverFest example from McGregor, schools - children and adults. River cleanup – adopt a landing, adopt an island, adopt a river, citizen monitoring.

2. Education Opportunities/Outreach

[Added at Wkshp O]

Main Concerns

- 6) What & where a refuge is and the purpose of a refuge.
- 7) Nongame species - what are threats.
- 8) Loss of habitat.
- 9) Potential Solutions
- 10) Educate public on above issues.

3. The Issue: Funding Inequities

[Added at Wkshp W]

Main Concerns

- 1) Environmental funding is often tied to navigational funding, but at much lower amounts-uneven.
- 2) Lack of direct funding to Refuge (UMR) in light of commercial use of Refuge.
- 3) Money and funding may not be the solution to habitat issues ...changes in philosophical perspective.
- 4) Public money is used mostly to subsidize large corporations – should be more equitably distributed for all citizens benefits.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Fully fund the programs and facilities as outlined in CCP.
- 2) Assess all UMR funding holistically across all agencies and establish shared spending priorities based on ecologically sound and sustainable resource objectives.

4. The Issue: Intergovernmental Challenges (Fed., State, Local)

[Added at Wkshp O, but not discussed as a separate issue]

5. The Issue: Land Acquisition

[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]

Main Concerns *[Source: Refuge Fact Sheet]*

- 1) Acquisition of lands to meet resource needs has been slowed by limited land acquisition appropriations from Congress.
- 2) Public attitudes toward acquisition are mixed. Some people favor additions to the Refuge to provide both resource and public use benefits, while others are philosophically opposed to lands and waters moving from private to public ownership.
- 3) Lands within the 1987 Refuge Master Plan delineations continue to face various levels of threat from development including recreational structures, timber harvest, agricultural/commercial use, and filling for commercial and industrial development.
- 4) *[Added at Wkshp P]* After reviewing the 1987 Master Plan as it relates to lands bordering on the Refuge, there is the challenge of developing contractual relationships (conservation easements, best management practices, purchase or lease etc.) of FWS with such landowners and conservancy organizations on properties near rivers, blufflands, floodplains, watersheds, etc. that affect the Refuge.
- 5) *[Added at Wkshp S]* Lost Mound will not be acquired.
- 6) *[Added at Wkshp S]* Lack of funds.
- 7) *[Added at Wkshp S]* Lack of response time when land becomes available.
- 8) *[Added at Wkshp S]* Requisition guidelines are too strict.
- 9) *[Added at Wkshp S]* Lack of Inter-agency coordination/communication.

Additional Discussion Notes

- 1) O--Lack of staff and funds.
- 2) O--Need to expand approved purchase

boundaries.

- 3) O--Takes too long to go through the process to purchase land.
- 4) O--Lack of cooperation between agencies, land trusts, individuals to acquire lands.
- 5) O--Lack of staff to purchase and manage desirable acquisitions.
- 6) I--Add "land protection " to title; include discussion about easements.
- 7) I--The length of time it takes to complete purchases due to limited staffing in reality and funding is a main concern.
- 8) I--Is the existing acquisition boundary adequate to protect the resource? The buffer zone between Refuge boundary and adjacent lands (i.e. developed lands) is not adequate; develop ability to purchase buffer areas to protect the Refuge.

Potential Solutions

- 1) P--Purchase key parcels that would assist in alleviating/reducing off-Refuge problems.
- 2) P--Work with interest groups / property owners to assist in protecting key parcels.
- 3) P--Utilize land acquisition to resolve access issues.
- 4) P--Work to get dollars to acquire highest priority parcels utilizing all sources of funding.
- 5) O--Advocate greater funding for acquisition and staffing. Need person dedicated to land acquisitions.
- 6) O--Identify opportunities for land acquisitions both within and outside designated acquisition boundaries.
- 7) O--Collaborate with land trust, interested parties, and state agencies to protect environmental sensitive and valuable areas.
- 8) O--Expand boundaries to better protect watershed, including bluffs and up river to MN/St. Paul.
- 9) S--Budget requests to acquire specific properties in fulfillment of mission.
- 10) S--Loosen restrictions to acquire land: house on property OK.
- 11) S--Promote inter-agency cooperation to

- acquire land.
- 12) S--Develop a process to coordinate strategic planning for designated areas.
 - 13) S--Representatives from FWS work with Ducks Unlimited and other non-governmental agencies to obtain funding for acquisition.
 - 14) S--Public education of the benefits on land acquisition.
 - 15) S--Newsletters, pamphlets.
 - 16) S--Education of public/increase awareness of the benefits of public lands.
 - 17) Informational meetings.
 - 18) More involvement with special groups: boy scouts, girl scouts, schools.
 - 19) Publishing information in local and regional media.
 - 20) S--Better coordinate all federal land use with the Corps of Engineers.
 - 21) S--Broaden the set of tools used to reduce threats to the Refuge:
 - 22) Simple acquisition.
 - 23) Land management agreements/contracts.
 - 24) Easements.
 - 25) S--Adjacent lands held responsible for damage done to Refuge lands.
 - 26) S--Get army to be held responsible for Lost Mound land and clean up.
 - 27) I--Expand Refuge boundaries to include uplands areas.
 - 28) I--Put more emphasize on land acquisition identified in approved plans.
 - 29) I--Educate legislators and have a framework in place that when the catastrophic floods occur a program would be in place to purchase lands such as the Department of Agriculture's EWRP (Emergency Wetland Reserve Program) which had funding after the 1993 flood.
 - 30) I--Improve efficiency of acquisition process; be capable of acting quickly to purchase tracts; be more creative using NGOs, easements, options to purchase, purchasing development rights,

- 31) I--Develop ability to purchase buffer areas to protect refuge; develop partnerships to strengthen support on properties adjacent to Refuge.
- 32) I--Re-evaluate existing acquisition boundary.
- 33) I--Partner with other agencies that purchase land; include lands purchased by other agencies in Refuge (i.e., COE may purchase land for mitigation).
- 34) I--Develop long term funding source for the river protection (i.e., trust fund for land acquisition).
- 35) I--Attempt to acquire potential restoration sites for endangered species (e.g., Driftless area) even if species is not currently present.

6. The Issue: Lost Mound Area

[Added at Wkshp S]

Main Concerns

- 1) Should be open to the public.
- 2) Priority to opening to public.
- 3) Timely and safe transfer from DoD to USFWS.
- 4) More public awareness of the ownership issue.

Potential Solutions

- 1) Work politically, and educate the public, urging them to pressure government for resolution.
- 2) Coordinate with environmental and conservation organizations, encouraging them to work together instead of against each other.
- 3) Oppose doing nothing.
- 4) Oppose DoD's proposal to do minimum cleanup and seal area off.
- 5) Get army to be held responsible for Lost Mound land and clean up.